



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*The Presidential Campaign of 1860.* By EMERSON DAVID FITE, Assistant Professor of History, Yale University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. Pp. xiii, 356.)

THE most important of Mr. Fite's conclusions are to be found in the introduction (pp. ix to xiii). The text includes discussions, of John Brown's raid and the speakership contest (pp. 1 to 91), and of the conventions (pp. 92 to 131), and an analysis of campaign arguments (pp. 132 to 235). There follow (pp. 236 to 342) reprints of the party platforms, and of speeches by Schurz, Douglas, Yancey, and Brownlow, which are not elsewhere readily accessible. The index (pp. 343 to 356) is not particularly satisfactory. Mr. Fite, believing that the campaign began with John Brown's raid, accomplishes the difficult feat of actually beginning there, avoiding the classic review of causes. He elsewhere avoids conventional facts, making his work more interesting to the historian, but somewhat deceptive for the general reader.

The material used is almost entirely of a public, contemporary character: speeches, editorials, public letters, etc.; practically not a fact is adduced which was not available at the time. This limitation is doubtless to be taken in connection with the author's statement in the preface: "Presidential campaigns in the United States are great popular debates". Mr. Fite scarcely mentions the strategy of the campaign, the adaptation of the argument to the locality, the stress put upon doubtful states, the arguments addressed to special classes of the population. Moreover, he gives nothing whatever on the organization of the campaign, the raising of the sinews of war, the meetings and plans of the leaders. No New England town-meeting was ever so unorganized as Mr. Fite's national campaign, and except for general references to North and South, it might have been waged in a country of uniform conditions. Mr. Fite's debaters are as oblivious of locality as Milton's debating demons of the fires of hell.

The use of the material employed, moreover, is not satisfactory. To cull from such sources the essential, to properly represent the real and the talking value of certain arguments, and to read the true meaning under oratorical forms, requires more thoroughgoing knowledge of the whole situation and more political insight than Mr. Fite exhibits. The fact that the "unconditional-union" supporters of Breckinridge in the mountain area were without a spokesman, causes them to remain unmentioned, although they ultimately determined the fate of two states. The Breckinridge leaders in the North are unexplained. The tariff is discussed in thirty lines (pp. 125, 164, 171, 197-198), stating that minor references were made to it. Yet the speech by Schurz, delivered at St. Louis and given in the appendix presumably as typical, is punctuated with that subject (pp. 250-251, 253-256, 261, 263, 265-268), and the New York speech of Yancey, also in the appendix, gives it three pages (pp. 310-312). Mr. Fite, moreover, is absolutely blind to the special

attempt of the Republicans to adapt their arguments to the laboring man, although that was the most marked feature of the contemporary anti-slavery campaign, and the above-mentioned speech by Schurz is its best exemplification. Nor is it that these speeches are left to tell their own story, for they are referred to (p. 186, etc.) and quoted (p. 182, etc.) on other subjects. There is no discussion of the results of the election except for the statement that Lincoln was elected. One is left to suppose that the election determined the Civil War and the line of division.

It seems scarcely courteous of Mr. Fite to state, as he does in his preface, that presidential campaigns "strangely enough . . . have hitherto been neglected as subjects for historical investigation". Mr. Rhodes's account of this period is three-quarters as long as Mr. Fite's and is a history of the campaign. Mr. Rhodes's account doubtless needs supplementing and review along several lines, and one of these is that of popular discussion. It is this niche which Mr. Fite's book might be supposed to cover, but it is not a history of the campaign, and it is not sufficiently ripe.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

*Diary of Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy under Lincoln and Johnson.* With an Introduction by JOHN T. MORSE, jr. In three volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1911. Pp. liii, 549; xvi, 653; xv, 670.)

FOR many years the existence of this Diary in manuscript has been well known. It afforded the basis for upwards of twenty articles—mostly on affairs under Lincoln—which Mr. Welles contributed to the *Galaxy* or the *Atlantic Monthly* from time to time between July, 1870, and April, 1878. Mr. Nicolay was permitted to see the Diary and to make a few extracts from the manuscript while he and Mr. Hay were preparing their elaborate study of Lincoln's career. But Mr. Nicolay was obliged to consult the Diary in Hartford under some restrictions. Almost thirty-two years after Mr. Welles's death, portions of the Diary began to appear in the *Atlantic Monthly* of November, 1909. Ten instalments in as many succeeding issues of the magazine, covering the period of the Civil War (July, 1862–April 22, 1865), were followed in February, 1910, and the eleven subsequent months, by other instalments on the period of Reconstruction (April, 1865–April 17, 1869). Comparison of the *Atlantic* text with the final and greatly extended text now published reveals the anonymous hand of a careful, if not expert, editor bent upon giving the reader as far as possible Mr. Welles's own words. The reader, we are told, "may have full confidence that the text of the diary has been in no way mutilated or revised". It seems fair, accordingly, to assume that no attempt has been made to produce a better piece of literary workmanship than was left by the author.